

## REMARKS

This application was originally filed on 28 December 2001 with thirty two claims, two of which were written in independent form. Claims 21 and 22 have been canceled, and Claims 1, 17, and 18 have been amended. No claims have been allowed.

The drawings were objected to for a variety of reasons. Figure 2 and the specification have been amended to overcome this objection.

Claims 1 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,552,840 to Ishii et al. ("Ishii"). The applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 1 has been amended to recite "a total internal reflection prism on said illumination and projection path." Claim 17 has been amended to recite "separating said filtered light beam from said first and second beams using a total internal reflection prism." Ishii does not show, teach, or suggest these limitations.

Claims 2, 3, 5-7, 12, 16, 18, 19, 23, and 29 were rejected as being anticipated by Ishii. Claims 2, 3, 5-7, 12, 16, 18, 19, 23, and 29 depend from Claims 1 or 17 and should be deemed allowable for that reason and on their own merits. For the reasons discussed above with respect to Claims 1 and 17, the prior art of record does not show, teach, or suggest the limitations of Claims 1 and 17, much less the limitations of Claims 1 and 17 in combination with the additional limitations of the additional claims.

Claims 4 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishii in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,285,415 to Brennesholtz ("Brennesholtz"). Claims 8-11 and 24-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishii in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0020809 A1 to Gibbon et al. Claims 13 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishii in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,097,456 to Wang ("Wang"). The applicant respectfully disagrees. For the reasons discussed above with respect to Claims 1 and 17, the prior art of record does not show, teach, or suggest the limitations of Claims 1 and 17, much less the limitations of Claims 1 and 17 in combination with the additional limitations of the dependent claims.

With respect to Claims 14 and 31, the Examiner stated "Wang teaches the recycling integrator is a solid integrating rod (column 7 lines 36-44) having a mirrored input aperture

(reference 140). The applicant respectfully submits reference 140 is not a mirrored input aperture, but rather an optical reflector.

In view of the amendments and the remarks presented herewith, it is believed that the claims currently in the application accord with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 and are allowable over the prior art of record. Therefore, it is urged that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles A. Brill  
Reg. No. 37,786

Texas Instruments Incorporated  
PO Box 655474 M/S 3999  
Dallas, TX 75265  
(972) 917-4379  
FAX: (972) 917-4418